REMARKS

I. SUBMITTED PTO FORM 1449 NOT ACKNOWLEDGED BY EXAMINER

The Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement with PTO Form 1449 on August 15, 2007, but Applicant has not received an initialed PTO Form 1449 to acknowledge receipt and consideration of the reference. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner kindly initial and supply a copy of the initialed PTO Form 1449 with the next communication.

II. ISSUES RELATED TO THE PRIOR ART – SECTION 103 – *SALAZAR* AND *THOMSON*

Claims 100-131 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Salazar* (US 2005/0131970) in view of *Thomson* (US 2004/0034615). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 100 and 116

Claims 100 and 116 each recites in part:

> *"a source ETL application receiving, from a user, input that selects one or more* ***database objects to be transported from a source database to a target database****"*

Neither *Salazar* nor *Thomson* teaches or suggests the quoted feature.

The Office Action relies on paragraph [0020] of *Salazar* to allegedly teach the quoted feature. However, paragraph [0020] describes extracting data from a source database. The data in a database is stored in database objects. The data extracted from the database objects is different than the database objects themselves such as tables, views, indexes, etc. There is a distinction between the database objects within a database and the data that those objects store.

The claims recite transporting the database objects themselves from a source database to a target database. In order to transport database objects, it is necessary to have information regarding the structure of those database objects. In contrast, extracting data that is contained within database objects in a target database only requires knowledge of the structure of the source database objects during the extraction process. Once the data are extracted, the structure of the objects in which it was stored becomes irrelevant. *Salazar* describes transporting data extracted from a source database, not transporting the database objects containing the data, as claimed.

Also, Claims 100 and 116 each recites in part:

> *"wherein said source database* ***includes*** *source database metadata that describes a* ***structure of*** *database objects of said source database"*

and

> *"said source ETL application causing generation of a* ***module comprising metadata that describes a structure of said one or more database objects*** *of said source database"*

No combination of *Salazar* and *Thomson* teaches or suggests the quoted feature.

Thomson does not, nor is it alleged to, teach or suggest the quoted feature. The Office Action relies instead on paragraph [0010] of *Salazar* to allegedly teach this feature. Paragraph [0010] describes an overview of the process of extracting data from one data source, transforming the data, and loading the data into a target system. However, the details of how this is accomplished in *Salazar* are quite different from what is claimed.

Salazar does not mention that the source database includes metadata that describes the structure of source database objects, as claimed. However, even if it is reasonable to assume that *Salazar*'s source database includes metadata that describes the structure of source database objects, *Salazar* still does not teach the claimed features.

The Office Action appears to consider the data files 18 shown in Figure 1 to be equivalent to the claimed module. However, there is no mention that *Salazar*'s data files 18 comprise metadata that describes the structure of source database objects. The metadata mentioned in the cited paragraph is metadata that describes the relationship between the extracted user and course data, and this metadata is independent of the structure of the source database objects in which this data were stored in the source database. Once the data are extracted from the source database, *Salazar* does not describe any motivation or use for retaining the source database metadata along with the extracted course and user data.

Claims 100 and 116 further recite in part:

> *"wherein reading said module causes said target ETL application to perform:*
> **modifying said target ETL metadata based on said source ETL metadata** read from said module to describe a structure of said one or more database objects of said target database"

The Office Action relies on paragraph [0026] of *Salazar* to allegedly teach the quoted feature. Paragraph [0026] describes the application of XSL transforms to the XML data files that hold the user and course data extracted from the source database. The Office Action appears to consider the XSL transformation of data files to be equivalent to the target ETL application. However, the source ETL metadata is defined to be data included in the source ETL application separate from the source database metadata, but which describes a structure of the source database objects. As explained above, no source database metadata is placed into *Salazar*'s source data files (module). Thus, it is not possible for *Salazar*'s XSL transformation (target ETL application) to read such source database metadata from the source data files, as claimed.

Furthermore, if the XSL stylesheets are considered equivalent to the target ETL application metadata, there is no disclosure that *Salazar* modifies the XLS stylesheets

(target ETL application metadata) based on the source ETL application metadata (structure of source database object) read from the source data files 18 (modules).

In addition, claims 100 and 116 recite:

> *"modifying said target database metadata based on said metadata read from said module to describe the structure of said one or more database objects of said source database"*

The Office Action relies on paragraphs [0029]-[0031] of *Salazar* to allegedly teach this quoted feature. Paragraph [0031] states:

> *"Advantageously, the flexibility of the present invention generates new unique identifiers on target system while maintaining* ***links between progress data, instructor information and user information that existed in source system.***"

Links between progress data, instructor information, and user information are not the same as information about the structure of database objects. The links described in Salazar may associate data objects with each other, but these links are independent of how the data was stored within **database** objects in the source database.

In addition, there is no mention in *Salazar* of target database metadata that describes the structure of one or more target database objects. However, even if we assume that such target metadata exists, there is no mention of modifying the target database metadata based on metadata read from the source data files (module).

Applicant has identified several features of Claims 100 and 116 that are not taught or suggested by any combination of *Salazar* and *Thomson*. Therefore, Claims 100 and 116 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of *Salazar* and *Thomson*. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 108 and 124

Claims 108 and 124 recite a feature that is very similar to a quoted feature of Claims 100 and 116:

"wherein said source database ***includes*** *source database metadata that describes a* ***structure*** *of said internal database object of said source database"*

The Office Action states that Claims 108 and 124 are rejected for the same reasons as for Claims 100 and 116. Thus, the arguments given above that traverse the rejection of Claims 100 and 116 also traverse the rejection of Claims 108 and 124. Therefore, Claims 108 and 124 are each patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of *Salazar* and *Thomson*. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims

Each of the claims not discussed thus far is directly or indirectly dependent on one of the independent claims that have been shown above to be patentable over the combination of *Salazar* and *Thomson*. The dependent claims are patentable over the combination of *Salazar* and *Thomson* for at least the same reasons as for their independent base claim by virtue of their dependency. Therefore, each of the dependent claims is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of *Salazar* and *Thomson*. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, each of the dependent claims introduces one or more additional features that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: March 31, 2010

/DeborahLCaswell#61766/
Deborah L. Caswell
Reg. No. 61,766

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 544
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 754-1455
Facsimile No.: (408) 408-1076